

S/N: 09/295,288

Atty Dkt No. 1610 (USW 0487 PUS)

Claim 1 recites a system for integrating call detail records for a multiple network environment. The system comprises access manager control logic, switching control logic, and an operations support system. The access manager control logic is connected to a wireless network. The access manager control logic is configured to generate a wireless call detail record in response to placement of a wireless call from a call source having an identity. The switching control logic is connected to a wireline network, and is configured to generate a wireline call detail record. The operations support system has call detail record control logic configured to receive the wireless call detail record from the access manager control logic, and to receive the wireline call detail record from the switching control logic. The call detail record control logic of the operations support system is further configured to combine wireless and wireline call detail records that correspond to the same customer into an integrated call record.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Mirza. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim as found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The Examiner correctly states that identity of terminology is not required. However, although identity of terminology is not required, the single prior art reference must describe each and every element set forth in the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Mirza fails to describe or suggest the claimed access manager control logic configured to generate a wireless call detail record, and the call detail record control logic at the operations support system receiving the wireless call detail record from the access manager control logic, receiving the wireline call detail record from the switching control logic and combining the wireline and wireless call detail records into an integrated call record.

Mirza describes a method for integrated billing and an integrated wireline-wireless system. Mirza uses an advanced intelligent network (AIN) service control point (SCP) 102 to generate wireless and wireline bills, and does not describe or suggest the claimed access manager control logic and operations support system in combination with the other

S/N: 09/295,288

Atty Dkt No. 1610 (USW 0487 PUS)

recited limitations. The Examiner has directed applicants' attention to the drawing and col. 3, line 13 - col. 4; line 40 of Mirza. Mirza describes AIN SCP 102 performing billing functions for calls in wireless section 200 (col. 3, lines 35-37).

Applicants believe that claim 1 is patentable over Mirza because Mirza fails to describe or suggest the claimed access manager control logic generating a wireless call detail record and the call detail record control logic of the operations support system receiving the wireless call detail record from the access manager control logic, combined with the other claimed features. The Examiner states that the fact that Mirza uses different terminology does not distinguish the claims. Mirza uses different technology, and Mirza does not describe the identical invention recited by claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites that the access manager control logic is connected to a wireless network and generates a wireless call detail record in response to placement of a wireless call from a call source having an identity. Claim 1 further recites an operation support system having call detail record control logic configured to receive the wireless call detail record from the access manager control logic. **The access manager control logic is connected to the wireless network and is not identical to a service control point (SCP).** This is exemplified in Figure 1 of applicants' application where access manager control logic is indicated at 14 on the wireless side of the network and integrated service control point (ISCP) 16 is shown on the wireline side of the network. Mirza describes AIN SCP 102 performing billing functions for calls in wireless section 200, but does not describe or suggest the specific elements and functions defined by independent claim 1. That is, Mirza does not anticipate the invention defined by independent claim 1 because Mirza does not describe the identical invention defined by claim 1. Claim 1 recites a specific collection of elements operating and performing functions in a specified way to achieve integrated call detail records. Because Mirza does not describe all of the claimed elements and functions, and the differences between the claimed invention and Mirza are non-obvious, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Mirza.

Claims 2-11 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable. Claim 12 is an independent claim, and is believed to be patentable for similar reasons discussed above for claim 1. Claims 13-18 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

S/N: 09/295,288

Atty Dkt No. 1610 (USW 0487 PUS)

Claim 19 is an independent claim, and is also believed to be patentable for similar reasons as discussed above for claim 1. Claim 20 is a dependent claim and as such is also believed to be patentable.

Further, some of the dependent claims are believed to recite further patentable subject matter. For example, the Examiner has rejected dependent claims 2, 13, and 20 as anticipated by Mirza. These claims recite that the operation support system receives the wireless call detail record from the access manager in a first call detail record stream. Mirza fails to describe these claimed features.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 14 as being unpatentable over Mirza. The Examiner has failed to provide a reference that describes or suggests the subject matter of dependent claims 3 and 14. Claims 3 and 14 recite that the access manager sends the wireless call detail record over a signaling network to the switching logic. The subject matter is not described or suggested by Mirza.

In summary, applicants believe that claims 1-20 are patentable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request the Examiner allow the claims in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Fargano et al.

By Jeremy J. Curcui
Jeremy J. Curcui
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicants

Date: May 22, 2002

BROOKS & KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351